Summary of Tysons Corner Coordinating Committee Meeting September 26, 2005 7:00 PM

Fairfax Chamber of Commerce, 8230 Old Courthouse Road (Note: Underlined reference will be web links to handout material)

- I. Call to Order: An announcement was made that the next meeting (October 10, 2005) will be at the McLean Governmental Center in the community meeting room. William Lue, a resident of Lillian Court at Tysons II, was introduced as a new member of the Coordinating Committee. The committee also approved the September 12, 2005 meeting summary.
- II. Additional Ownership Information: At the September 12, 2005 meeting, the committee requested a list of the owners of multiple properties regardless of whether parcels are contiguous property. Staff provided a handout that contained a table showing owners of land with more than 5 acres. See handout on Ownership of Commercial Land (including Apartments) over 5 acres in Tysons Corner.
- III. Status of Transportation Consultant Work: Staff stated to the committee that the Tysons consultant (Cambridge Systematics) is finalizing an existing conditions report for Tysons Corner and developing a transportation model that will test future development alternatives proposed by the committee. The model has been calibrated to the year 2000 (the base year) and the Council of Governments (COG) 2030 forecast (Round 7) is being used for the first test model run. The committee requested that staff provide a summary of the COG Round 7 data being used to test the model.

In addition, Lewis Grimm from Cambridge Systematics provided a handout to the committee that addressed committee member questions from the July 11, 2005 committee meeting. See handout on the Response to Committee Member Questions on Transportation Existing Conditions. The committee had comments concerning the quality of some traffic count data. Mr. Grimm indicated that most of the data problems were in the year 2000 when VDOT changed data collection methods. Mr. Grimm stated that VDOT data were supplemented with other data sources.

IV. Current Plan's Rail Intensification Areas compared to other Transit Station Area Plans: At the request of the committee, staff prepared information on the general concept of transit-related intensification areas and examples in Fairfax County. The information provided indicates that transit-related intensification areas are based on walk time distances. The 5 to 7 minutes walk distance from a transit station is considered the primary intensification area, which is an area within ½ mile from the station. The 10 to 15 minutes walk distance (or approximately ½ mile) is considered the secondary intensification area in which transitions in intensity should be provided to nearby stable neighborhoods.

The current Comprehensive Plan has applied this concept at both existing and future transit stations. When specific transit station location is not yet known, the Plan addresses transit-related intensification at a conceptual level, which is the case in Tysons Corner and the Route 28/CIT transit station area (both areas have Plan text expressing potential intensification areas with general radius distances). However, when transit station locations are known, the intensification concept is applied based on known walking distances from a transit station; the result is parcel specific Plan recommendations; the examples provided for this circumstance were the Wiehle and Dunn Loring transit station areas as well as Fairlee/Metro-West in the Vienna TSA. See handout on Current Transit-Related Intensification Areas. Also, see the 11 by 17 map entitled Comparison of Rail-

Related Intensification/Transition Areas in Tysons Corner, which compares the current Tysons Corner Plan's 1000 feet and 1600 feet intensification areas to the ¼ and ½ mile intensification/transition areas.

The committee was concerned about how to provide walkable pedestrian environments around future Tysons Corner rail stations. In addition, the committee questioned whether the current Plan's secondary intensification area of 1600 feet should be expanded to include a larger area, with the provision of a walkable and pedestrian-oriented environment. Staff responded by stating that the current Plan addresses additional intensity beyond 1600 feet to provide a transition in intensity and scale of development. In addition, the committee requested more information on how Form Based Codes can be used to shape future transit oriented development.

V. Discussion on Affordable Housing and Workforce Housing: Jim Edmondson presented to the committee a presentation on Developing Affordable Workforce Housing. In his presentation, Mr. Edmondson indicated that current approaches to providing affordable housing are inadequate and new more creative approaches are needed to address this issue. His presentation focused on approaches to provide workforce housing, which he defined as housing for public employees, young professionals, retail and service workers earning 50 – 120% of the area median household income (or \$45,000 – \$100,000 per year). He also outlined several models that show how workforce housing could be provided in redevelopments through the use of proffers and deed restrictions. For these approaches to work, the Plan would need to allow landowners an increase in intensity that is tied to the provision of workforce housing. The examples provided on current workforce housing projects were mostly on Universities and other institutions. See the PowerPoint presentation on Developing Affordable Workforce Housing at Tysons Corner.

The committee had several concerns about the implementation of this approach to workforce housing. These concerns include: 1) since Tysons Corner has only a few landowners with large land holdings, few owners may be willing to provide workforce housing under this approach; 2) the examples of where the concept has been applied were institutions, which have different approaches to financing than private development; 3) maintenance fees may become problematic in owner occupied workforce units; 4) assumed reductions in parking may not be realistic; and 5) the complexities, such as preventing subleasing and retaining units for intended income levels will be problematic.

In addition to these concerns, the committee requested: 1) more information on approaches to affordable and workforce housing in other areas; 2) information on the current Fairfax County Affordable Dwelling Unit Ordinance; and 3) examples of parking ratios used for affordable housing; and 4) a specific request was made for parking provided at the Grovenor station in Montgomery County.

VI. Discussion on the Current Plan's Issues and Objectives: The committee reviewed the 12 major objectives in the Tysons Corner Plan. This initial review only identified two objectives not needing revisions, which were objectives one and three. Objective 1 indicates that Tysons Corner should be preserved and enhanced as a vital regional business center. Objective 3 indicates that the existing stable residential neighborhoods adjacent to Tysons Corner should be preserved and protected. Objective 12 was proposed for deletion since it focused on implementation. Many suggestions were made on all other objectives; the following highlights some of the types of changes identified. Since Objective 2 combined several issues, substantial modification is needed and may result in several new objectives addressing the need for improving the area's sense of

place, market success, and the provision for future quality development. Objective 4 was determined to be out of date and needs to be revised to indicate that future development intensification should occur in the four transit station areas. Since Objective 6 addressed several issues that include mixed use, circulation systems and transit friendly environments, this objective needs significant revision and may result in separating or combining these issues with other objectives. See the handout for Tysons Corner current Plan's Issues and Objectives.

In addition to the existing objectives, the committee considered the addition of an objective indicating the need to preserve small businesses and service uses in Tysons Corner; these small businesses provide services to the surrounding community as well as employers in Tysons Corner. As the discussion progressed, some committee members thought that the objectives should be expanded and made more complex, while other committee members thought each objective should be simple and address a single topic. The overall discussion fell into broad themes: 1) the provision of housing, 2) integrated transportation strategies, 3) urban design and transit oriented design (streetscape, grid of streets, and amenities), and 5) the creation of neighborhoods (creating an exciting place to live).

The committee requested more information on: 1) Department of Defense design guidelines which discourage transit oriented design, 2) Arlington County's planning objectives for transit station areas, and 3) Form Based Codes.

- VII. Informal Solicitation for Initial Outreach Services: The committee established a Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) to review and evaluate proposals submitted by consultants. The five committee members to serve on the SAC are Kate Hanley, Janyce Hedetniemi, George Barker, Douglas Koelemay and Bill Lecos.
- VIII. During Unstructured Thinking, a few additional comments concerned: 1) the need to know where efforts to provide affordable dwelling units have been successful and where efforts have not worked, 2) since rail is coming, the 1994 Plan expectations need modification, and 3) Plan objectives need to be general and not too specific.
- IX. Next meeting: Monday, October 10, 2005, 7 PM., Community Room at the McLean Governmental Center, 1437 Balls Hill Road, McLean, VA 22101. Topics to discuss include:
 - 1) Presentation on Form Based Codes.
 - 2) Continued discussion on the Current Plan's Issues and Objectives,
 - 3) Additional Information on Affordable Housing,
 - 4) Provide information on the Department of Defense new design guidelines.
- X. Adjourn (Meeting adjourned 10:00 PM)